

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL ACTION
	:	NO. 06-710-02
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 13-2625
CHRISTOPHER YOUNG	:	
	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **25th** day of **July, 2014**, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

- (1) Petitioner's pro se Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (ECF No. 254) is **DENIED with prejudice**;
- (2) Petitioner's pro se Motion to Amend § 2255 Petition (ECF No. 256), pro se Motion to Amend/Correct Claim to § 2255 Petition (ECF No. 260), and pro se Motion to Add Addendum (ECF No. 261) are **DENIED as moot**;
- (3) A certificate of appealability shall not issue;¹ and

¹ A court issuing a final order denying a § 2255 motion must also decide whether to issue a certificate of appealability. The Court may issue the certificate "...only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c)(2). "A petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists could

(4) The Clerk shall mark this case **CLOSED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." Pabon v. Mahanoy, 654 F.3d 385, 393 (3d Cir. 2011) (quoting Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003)). Here, Petitioner has not made such a showing, as each of the grounds he raised can be resolved without need of an evidentiary hearing. Therefore, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.